

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

6  
Copy  
RM H56C30

*C2*

NACA RM H56C30

**NACA**

# RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

EFFECT OF SEVERAL WING MODIFICATIONS ON THE SUBSONIC AND  
TRANSONIC LONGITUDINAL HANDLING QUALITIES OF THE  
DOUGLAS D-558-II RESEARCH AIRPLANE

By Jack Fischel and Donald Reisert

High-Speed Flight Station

**CLASSIFICATION CHANGED** Edwards, Calif.

**UNCLASSIFIED**

By authority of DACA Reels effective  
FRN-128 Date June 24, 1958  
but 8-17-55

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

This material contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOR AERONAUTICS**

WASHINGTON

June 5, 1956

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

[REDACTED]

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

[REDACTED]



EFFECT OF SEVERAL WING MODIFICATIONS ON THE SUBSONIC AND

TRANSONIC LONGITUDINAL HANDLING QUALITIES OF THE

DOUGLAS D-558-II RESEARCH AIRPLANE

By Jack Fischel and Donald Reisert

SUMMARY

The subsonic and transonic longitudinal handling qualities of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane were measured with several wing modifications designed to alleviate swept-wing instability and pitch-up. The airplane configurations investigated included the basic wing configuration and two wing-fence configurations in combination with retracted, free-floating, or extended slats, and a wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration. All configurations were tested in the clean condition.

None of the wing modifications had an appreciable effect on the decay in stick-fixed stability (pitch-up) exhibited by the airplane at moderate angles of attack, and all configurations were considered by the pilots to be unsatisfactory and uncontrollable in the pitch-up region. Both flight and wind-tunnel results indicated that the position of the horizontal tail should be lowered appreciably to obtain substantial improvement in longitudinal handling qualities of the airplane.

Wing fences had no apparent effect on airplane buffeting characteristics with slats retracted. With wing slats free to float, the onset of buffeting was delayed at low Mach numbers, whereas buffeting was generally seriously aggravated by wing chord-extensions. Fully extending the wing slats had no appreciable effect on buffeting at low and moderate lifts but delayed the intensity rise to higher lift levels.

The variations and the values over the Mach number range of the apparent stability parameter  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$ , the elevator control-force parameter  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$ , and the airplane normal-force-curve slope  $C_{N_\alpha}$  were relatively unaffected by any of the wing modifications investigated. None of the

[REDACTED]

wing modifications had an appreciable effect on the trim-stability characteristics of the airplane, and all configurations exhibited similar trends over the test Mach number range.

## INTRODUCTION

As part of the cooperative Air Force-Navy-NACA high-speed flight program, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is conducting a flight research program at the High-Speed Flight Station, Edwards, Calif., utilizing the Douglas D-558-II swept-wing research airplane. During the course of this flight program, the effects of various modifications designed to alleviate swept-wing instability and pitch-up were investigated from stalling speed up to a maximum Mach number of about 1.0 (refs. 1 to 3). The various airplane configurations investigated are tabulated in table I and include the basic wing configuration and two wing-fence configurations in combination with retracted, free-floating, or extended slats, and a wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration. The low-speed stalling characteristics of the airplane in each of the previously mentioned configurations, with flaps and landing gear retracted and extended, are presented in reference 4. The subsonic and transonic longitudinal handling characteristics of the airplane in each of the configurations investigated are presented and compared in this paper.

## SYMBOLS

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| $a_n$               | normal acceleration, g units   |
| $b$                 | wing span, ft  |
| $C_N$               | airplane normal-force coefficient, $\frac{a_n W}{qS}$  |
| $C_{N_\alpha}$      | rate of change of airplane normal-force coefficient with angle of attack, $\frac{dC_N}{d\alpha}$ , per deg |
| $c$                 | wing chord, ft   |
| $\bar{c}$           | mean aerodynamic chord of the wing, ft   |
| $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$ | rate of change of elevator control force with normal acceleration, lb/g                                    |

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$ | rate of change of elevator position with airplane normal-force coefficient, deg                              |
| $F_e$                    | elevator control force, lb   |
| $g$                      | acceleration due to gravity, ft/sec <sup>2</sup>   |
| $h_p$                    | pressure altitude, ft  |
| $i_t$                    | stabilizer setting with respect to fuselage center line, positive when leading edge of stabilizer is up, deg |
| $M$                      | free-stream Mach number  |
| $q$                      | free-stream dynamic pressure, lb/sq ft   |
| $S$                      | wing area, sq ft   |
| $W$                      | airplane weight, lb  |
| $\alpha$                 | angle of attack of airplane center line, deg   |
| $\delta_e$               | elevator position with respect to stabilizer, deg  |

#### AIRPLANE

The Douglas D-558-II airplane used in this investigation is equipped with both a Westinghouse J34-WE-40 turbojet engine, which exhausts out the bottom of the fuselage between the wing and the tail, and a Reaction Motors, Inc. LR8-RM-6 rocket engine, which exhausts out the rear of the fuselage. The airplane is air-launched from a Boeing B-29 mother airplane. A photograph of the airplane is shown in figure 1 and a three-view drawing is shown in figure 2. Pertinent airplane dimensions and characteristics of the unmodified airplane are listed in table II.

For the present series of tests the basic clean-wing configuration and two wing-fence configurations were investigated in combination with a slat; an outboard wing leading-edge chord-extension was also investigated (table I). The fence configurations are shown in figures 3 and 4. The inboard wing fences were incorporated in the original airplane configuration to improve the longitudinal stability characteristics of the airplane at low speeds and at high angles of attack ( $\alpha > 10^\circ$ ) when the wing slats were fully extended (ref. 5). The outboard wing fences were similar to the optimum fence configuration developed in the wind-tunnel investigation of reference 5 for improving the longitudinal stability

characteristics at high angles of attack in the airplane clean condition. The wing slats (figs. 5 and 6), may be locked in either the open (extended) or closed (retracted) position, or they may be unlocked (free floating). In the unlocked condition they are normally closed at low values of angle of attack or normal-force coefficient and open with increase in angle of attack. The left and right wing slats are interconnected and always have approximately the same position.

The wing leading-edge chord-extensions shown in figures 7 and 8 were similar to those tested in the wind tunnel and found to provide an improvement in static longitudinal stability at moderate angles of attack (refs. 6, 7, and unpublished data). The chord-extensions were approximately the NACA 63-008 airfoil profile in the streamwise direction and were faired into the wing profile over the span of the chord-extensions. In addition, the chord-extensions were faired into the wing tips and the inboard ends were flat-sided in the vertical streamwise plane. For this configuration the wing slats were locked closed and all fences were removed. Addition of the wing chord-extensions increased the wing area from 175 square feet to 181.2 square feet and the wing mean aerodynamic chord from 87.3 inches to 90.0 inches. For convenience in comparing these data with data for the unmodified airplane, however, all data presented are based on the dimensions of the unmodified airplane.

The airplane is equipped with an adjustable stabilizer, but there are no means provided for trimming out aileron or rudder-control forces. No aerodynamic balance or control-force boost system is used on any of the controls and longitudinal stick motion is linear with elevator motion. Hydraulic dampers installed on all control surfaces aid in preventing control-surface "buzz" and may influence stick forces at high control rates. Dive brakes are located on the rear portion of the fuselage.

#### INSTRUMENTATION

Among the standard NACA recording instruments installed in the airplane to obtain flight data were instruments which measured the following pertinent quantities:

- Airspeed
- Altitude
- Angle of attack
- Normal acceleration
- Pitching velocity and acceleration
- Stabilizer, elevator, and slat positions
- Elevator control force

All instruments were synchronized by a common timer.

The elevator position was measured at the inboard end of the control surface, and the stabilizer position was measured at the plane of symmetry. All control positions were measured perpendicular to the control hinge line.

An NACA high-speed pitot-static tube (type A-6 of ref. 8) was mounted on a boom  $4\frac{3}{4}$  feet forward of the nose of the airplane. The vane used to measure the angle of attack was mounted on the same boom about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  feet forward of the nose of the airplane. Angles of attack are presented as measured with only instrument corrections applied. However, any inherent errors, such as caused by upwash effects, are believed to have a negligible effect on the analysis of the data. The possible Mach number errors are about  $\pm 0.01$  at  $M < 0.8$  and about  $\pm 0.02$  at  $M \approx 0.95$ .

### TESTS

The longitudinal handling qualities of the Douglas D-558-II airplane were measured with flaps and landing gear retracted in the airplane configurations listed in table I.

Longitudinal trim data ranging from  $M \approx 0.6$  to  $M \approx 1.1$  were obtained with the various airplane configurations during gradual climbs and level-flight speed runs at altitudes ranging from about 28,000 to 39,000 feet. Static longitudinal stability and control characteristics in accelerated flight were determined for each configuration during wind-up turns from a Mach number of about 0.4 to a Mach number of 1.0 in the altitude range from 10,300 to 38,500 feet. Data for the higher Mach numbers were generally obtained at the higher altitudes, and conversely. Except for the wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration, the airplane center-of-gravity locations ranged from 24.5 to 27.3 percent of the wing mean aerodynamic chord. For the chord-extension configuration, two conditions of airplane center-of-gravity location were employed, ranging from 22.6 to 24.7 and from 28.0 to 28.2 percent of the wing mean aerodynamic chord. (Only a few maneuvers were performed at the rearward center-of-gravity location, inasmuch as both the results obtained and the wind-tunnel results of refs. 5, 6, 7, and unpublished data indicated that the airplane had less static stability for a given center-of-gravity location when chord-extensions were installed. All remaining maneuvers with the chord-extensions were subsequently performed at the forward center-of-gravity location, which was selected to provide about the same static stability as existed with the unmodified airplane having its center of gravity at about 26 to 27 percent mean aerodynamic chord.)

At  $M < 0.9$  the turns were performed using only the elevator, with the stabilizer remaining stationary during the maneuvers at settings ranging from about  $-0.2^\circ$  to  $3.6^\circ$ . At  $M > 0.9$ , the turns were initiated using the elevator control with the stabilizer stationary; however, because of the decreased elevator effectiveness and accompanying large control forces at these speeds, use of stabilizer control was required during each maneuver to obtain higher lift levels and angles of attack.

## PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Representative stability data plots, illustrating the characteristics of each of the configurations of the D-558-III airplane during wind-up turns at various Mach numbers, are shown in figures 9 to 14 and, for convenience, are tabulated in table I. Some of these data were presented previously in references 1 to 3, and are reproduced in this paper, as measured, for illustrative purposes. As such, the data of figures 9 to 14 include the dynamic effects of pitching, therefore are not for static conditions, particularly at the higher angles of attack. To compare the stick-fixed stability data of the several configurations for comparable static conditions (zero pitching acceleration), representative variations of elevator position with angle of attack at two Mach numbers are shown in figure 15. The buffet boundaries of the various airplane configurations investigated are presented in figure 16. The low-lift stability parameters of the airplane in each of the several configurations are presented in figures 17 and 18, and the elevator trim characteristics are presented in figure 19. Relative elevator-stabilizer effectiveness characteristics over the test Mach number range are shown in figure 20.

## DISCUSSION

### High-Lift Characteristics

Pitch-up characteristics.— In general, the data of figures 9 to 14 indicate the airplane has reasonably linear stability (as exhibited by the variation of  $\delta_e$  with  $\alpha$ ) and lift characteristics from low to moderate angles of attack. These characteristics become nonlinear at the higher values of  $\alpha$  for all configurations. It may be observed in many of the maneuvers of figures 9 to 14 that, when  $C_N$  reached moderate values, the relative increase in  $\alpha$  and  $C_N$  was greater than the increase in  $\delta_e$ , indicating a decrease in stick-fixed stability and the onset of a pitch-up. In some instances, because the data of figures 9 to 14 are not corrected for pitching acceleration effects, the pitch-up

appears to be accentuated by the reversal of control and the continued decrease in  $\alpha$  and  $C_N$ . In other instances, after the initial decrease in stability and accompanying pitch-up, a retrimming effect is apparent, with the airplane regaining stability at higher angles of attack (for example, fig. 12(d)). These effects have been discussed in references 1 to 3 for most of the wing modifications tested and are, perhaps, more readily apparent when the data are corrected to static conditions (fig. 15). In general, none of the wing configurations provided tolerable behavior or measurable improvement compared with the basic wing configuration; however, some reduction in divergence rates was noted below a Mach number of 0.80 with slats extended and chord-extensions (fig. 15). Over a Mach number range from 0.8 to 0.95, all configurations were characterized by an abrupt change in stability at the pitch-up. At all speeds the pilots reported experiencing a lightening of the stick-force gradient prior to, or accompanying, the reduction in stick-fixed stability. The reduction in the stick-force gradient tended to aggravate the pitch-up tendency by allowing the pilot to increase the control rate with little or no additional effort.

Invariably, the pilots felt they had little or no control over the magnitude of the overshoot load factors once the pitch-up region was penetrated, and they tended to apply excessive corrective control to recover. As a result, in all configurations the pilots considered the airplane to be completely unsatisfactory and uncontrollable in the pitch-up region, particularly during combat-type maneuvers, and probably quite dangerous at the low altitudes. On the basis of wind-tunnel tests performed on a model of the D-558-II airplane (ref. 9), as well as other wind-tunnel and flight investigations, it has been concluded that with the present tail configuration of the D-558-II airplane (height above wing-chord plane extended is about 0.698), a real cure of the pitch-up is not feasible. Lowering the horizontal tail to approximately the height of the wing-chord plane extended would be required to obtain substantial improvement in airplane longitudinal handling qualities.

Although some slight differences existed between the results for the various configurations, the values of  $C_N$  at which the stability decreased and pitch-up ensued varied from approximately 0.7 at  $M = 0.5$  to approximately 0.6 at  $M = 0.8$  and approximately 0.5 at  $M = 0.95$ . At  $M > 0.95$  an abrupt increase in the values of  $C_N$  for pitch-up occurred and, generally, these values were attained only infrequently in the reported tests (refs. 1 to 3).

Buffet characteristics.- In general, the decrease in stability and the onset of pitch-up for each configuration were only slightly preceded by, or almost coincided with, the onset of buffeting of the airplane. The levels of  $C_N$  at which the onset of buffeting occurred are shown in figure 16 as a function of Mach number for all configurations except the slats-extended configuration. With the slats fully extended,



moderate buffeting appeared to exist over most of the lower and moderate lift range. It was found that the wing fences alone had no effect on the buffeting characteristics. Unlocking the wing slats tended to delay wing separation effects to higher lifts, thereby causing the onset of buffet to occur at higher lift levels for  $M < 0.7$ . The level of lift coefficients for the start of buffeting with wing chord-extensions was lowered somewhat below  $M = 0.8$ , compared with the unmodified airplane, and the pilot objected to the increase in buffet intensity, which was on the order of  $\pm 0.5g$  at an altitude of about 30,000 feet. At  $M < 0.85$ , with either the chord-extension configuration or when the slats were retracted, the buffet-intensity rise occurred at a normal-force coefficient of about 0.05 above that for the onset of buffeting. When slats were unlocked (free floating) or fully extended, the increase in buffet intensity occurred quite gradually with increase in  $C_N$ , and the boundary for intensity rise varied from  $C_N \approx 1.0$  at  $M = 0.5$  to  $C_N \approx 0.75$  at  $M = 0.85$ . In the transonic region above  $M = 0.85$ , the buffet intensity rise for all configurations occurred at  $C_N \approx 0.5$ , or greater.

In none of these configurations did the pilots consider the onset of buffeting to be an adequate warning of the impending pitch-up during an accelerated maneuver. Because of the alleviation in buffeting and in pitch-up divergence rates with slats fully extended, the pilots thought this modification provided the most improvement to the longitudinal handling characteristics of the airplane. Conversely, the pilots considered the chord-extension configuration to be the most objectionable, despite some alleviation in the pitch-up divergence rate, because of the severity of buffeting.

#### Low-Lift Characteristics

Stability parameters.— The variation of the airplane normal-force-curve slope  $C_{N_\alpha}$  with Mach number for each of the configurations investigated is shown in figure 17. Within the accuracy of determination and within the scatter of  $C_{N_\alpha}$  values shown, unlocking the wing slats had a negligible effect on  $C_{N_\alpha}$  (figs. 17(a), (b), and (c)). The value of  $C_{N_\alpha}$  for the basic wing configuration increased from approximately 0.065 at  $M = 0.4$  to about 0.093 at  $M = 0.9$ , then decreased with further increase in Mach number.

Except for slight differences, the other configurations showed similar trends and values of  $C_{N_\alpha}$  over the test Mach number range. A notable difference in the values of  $C_{N_\alpha}$  can be observed at  $M < 0.65$ , where the two configurations with slats fully extended (figs. 17(d) and 17(e)) exhibited somewhat higher values than the other configurations investigated. The reasons for this effect are not apparent.

The variation of the apparent airplane stability parameter  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  and the elevator control-force parameter  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  with Mach number for each of the configurations is shown in figure 18. For Mach numbers up to about  $M = 0.7$ , the values of  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  and  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  of the basic wing configuration are substantially constant at about 10 and 12, respectively, (fig. 18(a)). At  $M \gtrsim 0.7$ , the values of both parameters increased rapidly with increase in Mach number, and at  $M = 1.0$ ,  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N} \approx 60$  and  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n} \approx 130$ . In the variations with Mach number of both parameters, unlocking the wing slats produces no apparent effect. As discussed in reference 10 for the airplane configuration incorporating inboard fences on the unmodified wing, most of the increase in  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  and  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  at  $M \lesssim 0.85$  may be attributed to an increase in airplane stability, inasmuch as the change in elevator effectiveness is not appreciable in this range. At  $M \gtrsim 0.85$ , however, a large decrease in elevator effectiveness is expected as  $M$  increases, and reference 11 indicates appreciable increases in airplane stability in this range; therefore, the large increases noted in the apparent stick-fixed and stick-free parameters at  $M \gtrsim 0.85$  probably result from these dual effects.

In general, little or no effect of modifying the basic wing configuration was shown by the variations of the apparent stick-fixed and stick-free stability parameters over the test Mach number range (fig. 18).

The largest differences in the values of  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  and  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  for the various configurations exist at the higher speeds, where the discrepancies appear to be aggravated by the rapid increases with Mach number of these two parameters. An almost constant difference in level of the values of  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  is noted in figure 18(f) for the two ranges of center of gravity

with the chord-extension configuration, and the data for the forward center-of-gravity location appear in better agreement with the data for the basic wing configuration. This effect was anticipated, since the investigation of references 6 and 7 indicated, for comparable center-of-gravity locations, the airplane with chord-extensions would exhibit slightly less stick-fixed stability than the unmodified airplane. A fairly complete discussion of the effects of the chord-extension on airplane stability was presented in reference 3.

An appreciable amount of the stability parameter data shown in this paper for the basic wing configuration and the inboard wing-fence configuration was also presented in reference 12 in which the data for the D-558-II airplanes being investigated were combined and presented for speeds up to  $M \approx 2.0$ . Since little difference was evident in the variations of  $\frac{dC_N}{d\alpha}$ ,  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$ , and  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  with  $M$  for the several configurations up to  $M = 1.0$ , it would appear the values and trends of these parameters at  $M > 1.0$  would be similar to those shown in reference 12.

Trim characteristics.— The variation with Mach number of the elevator angle required to trim the airplane in each of the configurations investigated, for conditions of 1 g flight at an altitude of 35,000 feet and at a constant weight of 13,000 pounds, is shown in figure 19. By utilizing the values of  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  shown for each configuration in figure 18, the original flight data obtained in each configuration were corrected to lift coefficients that would exist at the previously mentioned conditions.

The elevator trim curves for the basic wing configuration show the airplane has positive trim stability at  $M \lesssim 0.82$  and a small neutrally stable region near  $M \approx 0.85$  (fig. 19(a)). Starting at  $M \approx 0.87$ , as speed increased alternate airplane nose-down and nose-up trim changes occurred to  $M = 1.03$ , the maximum speed at which these data were obtained. For some stabilizer settings the trim changes were severe at  $M \approx 1.0$ .

Except for a slight difference in the magnitude of the values of  $\delta_e$  required for trim at comparable stabilizer settings, the elevator trim curves for all configurations exhibited similar characteristics, thereby indicating similar trim stability. The differences in the magnitude of  $\delta_e$  required for trim probably result from slight differences in airplane center of gravity for the several configurations, and also from possible slight differences in the wing center of pressure which resulted from the various wing modifications.

Although the trim data obtained on the subject D-558-II airplane were limited to subsonic and transonic speeds, similar data were obtained up to  $M \approx 2.0$  on the all-rocket D-558-II airplane (basic wing configuration) and are reported in reference 12. Because the trim data obtained on both airplanes at subsonic and transonic speeds are in excellent agreement, and because all configurations investigated on the subject airplane exhibited similar characteristics, it is anticipated that all configurations investigated would have trim characteristics at supersonic speeds similar to those shown in reference 12.

Relative elevator-stabilizer effectiveness.- Figure 19(a) shows the change in the incremental elevator angle required for trim for a given change in stabilizer position as Mach number increased. Cross-plotting the data of figure 19(a) at given Mach numbers provided a measure of the change in the relative elevator-stabilizer effectiveness  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  which is shown in figure 20 as a function of Mach number for the basic wing configuration. Although both controls tend to lose effectiveness at transonic speeds, it is evident from figure 20 that the loss in elevator effectiveness is much greater than the comparable loss in stabilizer effectiveness as  $M$  increases. This loss in elevator effectiveness is serious, since it necessitates the use of appreciably larger control deflections for trim and maneuvering in the transonic region, and tends to limit the maneuverability of the airplane. (See data at  $M > 0.9$ , figs. 9 to 14.)

Although sufficient trim-stability data were not obtained for each of the configurations to determine the individual relative elevator-stabilizer effectiveness, the relative agreement in all data obtained suggests the trends shown for  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  in figure 20 for the basic wing configuration would also hold true for each of the wing modifications investigated.

Also shown in figure 20 are the variations with Mach number of  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  obtained in other tests of the D-558-II airplane in either the basic wing configuration (ref. 12) or the inboard wing-fence configuration (ref. 10). The values of  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  from reference 10 were obtained from elevator trim stability curves, similar to the method used in the subject tests, for dives from 25,000 to 15,000 feet. The values of  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  from reference 12 were obtained from elevator and stabilizer maneuvers (pull-ups and wind-up turns) at altitudes generally in excess of 35,000 feet. The agreement shown in figure 20 for the values of  $\frac{d\delta_t}{d\delta_e}$  over the test Mach number range is good. The small discrepancies shown may be attributed to the technique and operating conditions under which these data were obtained, and to the accuracy of determination.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## CONCLUSIONS

Results of a longitudinal handling qualities investigation at subsonic and transonic speeds of the swept-wing Douglas D-558-II research airplane, in the basic clean-wing configuration and with various wing modifications designed to alleviate swept-wing instability and pitch-up, led to the following conclusions:

1. None of the wing modifications had an appreciable effect on the decay in stick-fixed stability (pitch-up) exhibited by the airplane at moderate angles of attack, particularly over a Mach number range from about 0.8 to 0.95. All configurations were considered unsatisfactory and uncontrollable in the pitch-up region by the pilots. On the basis of these tests and other flight and tunnel investigations, it is felt the position of the horizontal tail on this airplane should be lowered appreciably to obtain substantial improvement in longitudinal handling qualities.
2. Wing fences had no apparent effect on the buffeting characteristics with slats retracted; however, unlocking the wing slats raised the buffet boundary, below a Mach number of 0.70, above that for the retracted slats condition for the basic-wing, one-fence, and two-fence configurations. Wing chord-extensions lowered the buffet boundary, compared with the unmodified airplane configuration, up to a Mach number of 0.80 and caused an increase in buffet intensity which was objectionable to the pilot. Moderate buffeting appeared to exist over most of the lower and moderate lift range with the slats fully extended; however, this configuration did alleviate some of the pitch-up divergence rate and appeared to the pilots to provide the greatest improvement in the longitudinal handling characteristics of the airplane.
3. At low lift coefficients, the trends in the values of the apparent stability parameter  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  and the elevator control-force parameter  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  were relatively unaffected by any of the wing modifications investigated. The values of  $\frac{d\delta_e}{dC_N}$  increased by a factor of about 6 and the values of  $\frac{dF_e}{da_n}$  increased by a factor of about 11 as Mach number increased from 0.5 to 1.0.
4. The variation with Mach number of the airplane normal-force-curve slope  $C_{N_\alpha}$  was little affected by wing modification. Values of  $C_{N_\alpha}$  increased from about 0.065 at a Mach number of 0.4 to about 0.093 at a Mach number of 0.9, then decreased with further increase in Mach number.

5. None of the wing modifications had an appreciable effect on the trim-stability characteristics of the airplane and all configurations exhibited similar trends over the Mach number range. The airplane was stable at Mach numbers below about 0.82, and exhibited characteristic nose-down and nose-up trim changes between Mach numbers of about 0.87 and 1.03.

6. The loss in elevator effectiveness in the transonic speed range is appreciably greater than the comparable loss in stabilizer effectiveness. The relative elevator-stabilizer control-effectiveness parameter  $\frac{d\dot{\delta}_t}{d\delta_e}$  decreased from a value of about 0.43 at a Mach number of 0.6 to less than 0.2 at a Mach number of 1.0.

High-Speed Flight Station,  
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,  
Edwards, Calif., March 22, 1956.

## REFERENCES

1. Fischel, Jack, and Nugent, Jack: Flight Determination of the Longitudinal Stability in Accelerated Maneuvers at Transonic Speeds for the Douglas D-558-II Research Airplane Including the Effects of an Outboard Wing Fence. NACA RM L53A16, 1953.
2. Fischel, Jack: Effect of Wing Slats and Inboard Wing Fences on the Longitudinal Stability Characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II Research Airplane in Accelerated Maneuvers at Subsonic and Transonic Speeds. NACA RM L53L16, 1954.
3. Fischel, Jack, and Brunn, Cyril D.: Longitudinal Stability Characteristics in Accelerated Maneuvers at Subsonic and Transonic Speeds of the Douglas D-558-II Research Airplane Equipped With a Leading-Edge Wing Chord-Extension. NACA RM H54H16, 1954.
4. Fischel, Jack, and Reisert, Donald: Effect of Several Wing Modifications on the Low-Speed Stalling Characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II Research Airplane. NACA RM H55E31a, 1955.
5. Queijo, M. J., and Jaquet, Byron M.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Effect of Chordwise Fences on Longitudinal Stability Characteristics of an Airplane Model With a  $35^\circ$  Sweptback Wing. NACA RM L50K07, 1950.
6. Jaquet, Byron M.: Effects of Chord Discontinuities and Chordwise Fences on Low-Speed Static Longitudinal Stability of an Airplane Model Having a  $35^\circ$  Sweptback Wing. NACA RM L52C25, 1952.
7. Jaquet, Byron M.: Effects of Chord-Extension and Droop of Combined Leading-Edge Flap and Chord-Extension on Low-Speed Static Longitudinal Stability Characteristics of an Airplane Model Having a  $35^\circ$  Sweptback Wing With Plain Flaps Neutral or Deflected. NACA RM L52K21a, 1953.
8. Gracey, William, Letko, William, and Russell, Walter R.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of a Number of Total-Pressure Tubes at High Angles of Attack - Subsonic Speeds. NACA TN 2331, 1951. (Supersedes NACA RM L50G19.)
9. Queijo, M. J., and Wolhart, Walter D.: Wind-Tunnel Investigation of the Effects of Horizontal-Tail Position on the Low-Speed Longitudinal Stability Characteristics of an Airplane Model With a  $35^\circ$  Sweptback Wing Equipped With Chordwise Fences. NACA RM L51H17, 1951.

10. Sjoberg, S. A., Peele, James R., and Griffith, John H.: Flight Measurements With the Douglas D-558-II (BuAero No. 37974) Research Airplane. Static Longitudinal Stability and Control Characteristics at Mach Numbers Up to 0.87. NACA RM L50K13, 1951.
11. Silvers, H. Norman, and King, Thomas J., Jr.: Investigation at High Subsonic Speeds of the Effects of Various Underwing External-Store Arrangements on the Aerodynamic Characteristics of a 1/16-Scale Model of the Douglas D-558-II Research Airplane. NACA RM L55D11, 1955.
12. Ankenbruck, Herman O.: Determination of Longitudinal Handling Qualities of the D-558-II Research Airplane at Transonic and Supersonic Speeds to a Mach Number of About 2.0. NACA RM H54G29a, 1954.



TABLE I

## INDEX OF AIRPLANE CONFIGURATIONS INVESTIGATED

| Airplane configuration  | Location of center of gravity        | Figures showing configuration | Figures showing basic data for configuration |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Basic wing (no fences)<br>Slats retracted (locked closed)<br>Slats unlocked | 0.2498 to 0.2738<br>0.2458 to 0.2598 | 2, 5                          | 9(a), (b), (c), (d)<br>9(e), (f)             |
| Inboard wing fences<br>Slats retracted<br>Slats unlocked                    | 0.2518 to 0.2618<br>0.258            | 1, 3                          | 10(a), (b), (c), (d)<br>10(e), (f)           |
| Inboard and outboard wing fences<br>Slats retracted<br>Slats unlocked       | 0.2468 to 0.2628<br>0.2668 to 0.2678 | 3, 4                          | 11(a), (b), (c)<br>11(d)                     |
| Wing slats fully extended<br>(no wing fences)                               | 0.2528 to 0.2698                     | 5                             | 12(a), (b), (c), (d)                         |
| Wing slats fully extended and<br>inboard wing fences                        | 0.2548 to 0.2668                     | 5, 6                          | 13(a), (b), (c), (d)                         |
| Wing leading-edge chord-extensions<br>(no fences, slats retracted)          | 0.2268 to 0.2478<br>0.2808 to 0.2828 | 7, 8                          | 14(a), (b)                                   |

TABLE II  
PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UNMODIFIED  
DOUGLAS D-558-II AIRPLANE

## Wing:

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Root airfoil section (normal to 0.30 chord of unswept panel) | NACA 63-010  |
| Tip airfoil section (normal to 0.30 chord of unswept panel)  | NACA 631-012 |
| Total area, sq ft  | 175.0        |
| Span, ft   | 25.0         |
| Mean aerodynamic chord, in.                                  | 87.301       |
| Root chord (parallel to plane of symmetry), in.              | 108.51       |
| Tip chord (parallel to plane of symmetry), in.               | 61.18        |
| Taper ratio  | 0.565        |
| Aspect ratio   | 3.570        |
| Sweep at 0.30 chord of unswept panel, deg                    | 35.0         |
| Sweep of leading edge, deg                                   | 38.8         |
| Incidence at fuselage center line, deg                       | 3.0          |
| Dihedral, deg  | -3.0         |
| Geometric twist, deg   | 0            |
| Total aileron area (rearward of hinge line), sq ft           | 9.8          |
| Aileron travel (each), deg                                   | ±15          |
| Total flap area, sq ft                                       | 12.58        |
| Flap travel, deg   | 50           |

## Horizontal tail:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Root airfoil section (normal to 0.30 chord of unswept panel) | NACA 63-010 |
| Tip airfoil section (normal to 0.30 chord of unswept panel)  | NACA 63-010 |
| Area (including fuselage), sq ft                             | 39.9        |
| Span, in.  | 145.6       |
| Mean aerodynamic chord, in.                                  | 41.75       |
| Root chord (parallel to plane of symmetry), in.              | 53.6        |
| Tip chord (parallel to plane of symmetry), in.               | 26.8        |
| Taper ratio  | 0.50        |
| Aspect ratio   | 3.59        |
| Sweep at 0.30 chord line of unswept panel, deg               | 40.0        |
| Dihedral, deg  | 0           |
| Elevator area, sq ft   | 9.4         |
| Elevator travel, deg   |             |
| Up   | 25          |
| Down   | 15          |
| Stabilizer travel, deg                                       |             |
| Leading edge up  | 4           |
| Leading edge down  | 5           |

## Vertical tail:

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Airfoil section (normal to 0.30 chord of unswept panel) | NACA 63-010 |
| Area, sq ft   | 36.6        |
| Height from fuselage center line, in.                   | 98.0        |
| Root chord (parallel to fuselage center line), in.      | 146.0       |
| Tip chord (parallel to fuselage center line), in.       | 44.0        |
| Sweep angle at 0.30 chord of unswept panel, deg         | 49.0        |
| Rudder area (rearward of hinge line), sq ft             | 6.15        |
| Rudder travel, deg                                      | ±25         |

## Fuselage:

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| Length, ft                 | 42.0 |
| Maximum diameter, in.      | 60.0 |
| Fineness ratio             | 8.40 |
| Speed-retarder area, sq ft | 5.25 |

## Engines:

|          |           |
|----------|-----------|
| Turbojet | J34-WE-40 |
| Rocket   | LR8-EM-6  |

## Airplane weight, lb:

|                          |        |
|--------------------------|--------|
| Full jet and rocket fuel | 15,570 |
| Full jet fuel            | 12,382 |
| No fuel                  | 10,822 |




Figure 1.- Three-quarter front view of Douglas D-558-II airplane. Inboard fences shown installed on wing.

E-488




Figure 2.- Three-view drawing of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane.  
All dimensions in inches.





Figure 3.- Plan form and sections of the wing of the D-558-II airplane showing the location and shape of wing fences (stall-control vanes) used in the investigation.



E-584  
Figure 4.- Photograph of the D-558-II wing, showing the inboard and out-  
board fences (stall-control vanes) on the wing.





Figure 5.- Plan form and sections of the wing of the D-558-II airplane showing details of the wing slat in the retracted and extended positions.



E-817  
Figure 6.- Photograph of right wing of D-558-II airplane showing slat in fully extended position and inboard fence on wing.








Figure 7.- Plan form and section of the wing of the D-558-II airplane showing the wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration.




E-927

Figure 8.- Photograph of the wing of the D-558-II airplane showing the wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration.




(a)  $h_p \approx 22,000$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.268\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.

Figure 9.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Basic wing configuration.




(b)  $h_p \approx 29,800$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.262\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.

Figure 9.- Continued.




(c)  $h_p \approx 25,900$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at 0.2495;  
slats retracted.

Figure 9.- Continued.




(d)  $h_p \approx 37,200$  feet; center of gravity at  $0.272\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.

Figure 9.- Continued.



(e)  $h_p \approx 22,700$  feet;  $i_t = 1.7^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.253\bar{c}$ ; slats unlocked.


Figure 9.- Continued.



(f)  $h_p \approx 29,800$  feet;  $i_t = 1.2^\circ$ ; center of gravity at 0.2495;  
slats unlocked.


Figure 9.- Concluded.






(a)  $h_p \approx 23,300$  feet;  $i_t = 2.2^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.259\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.

Figure 10.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Inboard wing-fence configuration.




(b)  $h_p \approx 25,500$  feet;  $i_t = 2.3^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.258\bar{c}$ ;  
slats retracted.

Figure 10.- Continued.




(c)  $h_p \approx 28,700$  feet;  $i_t = 2.0^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.253\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.

Figure 10.- Continued.




(d)  $h_p \approx 34,800$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.261\bar{c}$ ;  
slats retracted.

Figure 10.- Continued.




(e)  $h_p \approx 22,700$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.25\bar{c}$ ; slats unlocked.

Figure 10.- Continued.




(f)  $h_p \approx 24,500$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.25\bar{c}$ ;  
slats unlocked.

Figure 10.- Concluded.



(a)  $h_p \approx 26,200$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.261\bar{c}$ ; slats retracted.


Figure 11.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Inboard and outboard wing-fence configuration.



(b)  $h_p \approx 30,400$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.260\bar{c}$ ;  
slats retracted.


Figure 11.- Continued.






(c)  $h_p \approx 35,600$  feet;  $i_t = 2.1^\circ$ ; center of gravity at 0.2483;  
slats retracted.

Figure 11.- Continued.




(d)  $h_p \approx 20,200$  feet;  $i_t = 2.3^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.266\bar{c}$ ;  
slats unlocked.

Figure 11.- Concluded.




(a)  $h_p \approx 20,700$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.253\bar{c}$ .

Figure 12.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Wing slats fully extended; no wing fences.




(b)  $h_p \approx 26,500$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.252\bar{c}$ .

Figure 12.- Continued.




(c)  $h_p \approx 23,000$  feet;  $i_t = 1.3^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.262\bar{5}$ .

Figure 12.- Continued.




(d)  $h_p \approx 27,000$  feet;  $i_t = 1.3^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.265\bar{c}$ .

Figure 12.- Concluded.



(a)  $h_p \approx 18,300$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.260\bar{c}$ .


Figure 13.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Wing slats fully extended and inboard wing fences.



(b)  $h_p \approx 21,000$  feet;  $i_t = 1.6^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.258\bar{c}$ .


Figure 13.- Continued.






(c)  $h_p \approx 28,500$  feet;  $1_t = 2.3^0$ ; center of gravity at  $0.258\bar{c}$ .

Figure 13.- Continued.




(d)  $h_p \approx 35,150$  feet; center of gravity at  $0.25\bar{c}$ .

Figure 13.- Concluded.



(a)  $h_p \approx 23,500$  feet;  $i_t = 1.7^\circ$ ; center of gravity at  $0.241\bar{c}$ .

Figure 14.- Static longitudinal stability characteristics of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane in turning flight. Wing leading-edge chord-extension configuration.



(b)  $h_p \approx 32,000$  feet; center of gravity at  $0.246\bar{c}$ .

Figure 14.- Concluded.




Figure 15.- Effect of several wing modifications on the apparent stick-fixed stability characteristics of the D-558-II airplane at two representative Mach numbers. ( $\delta_e$  values corrected to zero pitching acceleration.)




Figure 16.- Effect of wing modifications on buffet boundary of the D-558-II airplane.




Figure 17.- Effect of several wing modifications on the variation of  $C_{N\alpha}$  with Mach number for the Douglas D-558-II research airplane.




Figure 18.- Effect of several wing modifications on the variation of  $d\delta_e/dC_N$  and  $dF_e/d\alpha_n$  with Mach number for the Douglas D-558-II research airplane.






Figure 19.- Effect of several wing modifications on the variation with Mach number of the elevator deflection required to trim the Douglas D-558-II research airplane.  $h_p = 35,000$  feet;  $W = 13,000$  pounds;  $a_n = 1$ .




Figure 20.- Variation with Mach number of the relative elevator-stabilizer effectiveness of the Douglas D-558-II research airplane. Basic wing configuration.

[REDACTED]

NASA Technical Library  
  
3 1176 01435 9971

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2197  
2198  
2199  
2200  
2201  
2202  
2203  
2204  
2205  
2206  
2207  
2208  
2209  
2210  
2211  
2212  
2213  
2214  
2215  
2216  
2217  
2218  
2219  
2220  
2221  
2222  
2223  
2224  
2225  
22